

101. Have you ever heard of something called
Universal Lifeline Telephone Service?

YES 50- 1 (Ask Q.102)
NO 2 (Go to Q.104)

IF YES (Q.101):

102. Do you have that service now?

YES 51- 1 (Go to 901, ORANGE)
NO 2

103. What do you think that is? (PROBE:) Who
do you think it is for? (DO NOT READ LIST)

FOR LOW INCOME PEOPLE 52- 1
REDUCED/LOWER RATES 2 (Go to Q.105)
LIMITED CALLING 3
OTHER X
DON'T KNOW 0

104. Are you aware that the phone company offers
a special type of phone service for lower-
income people?

YES 53- 1 (Ask Q.105)
NO 2
NOT SURE / DON'T KNOW 0 (Go to top of next
page)

IF YES (Q.104) OR "1" OR "2" (Q.103):

105. Have you ever tried to get this service?

YES 54- 1 (Ask Q.106)
NO 2 (Go to Q.108)

IF YES:

106. Do you have it?

YES 55- 1 (Go to 901, ORANGE)
NO 2 (Ask Q.107)

IF NO (Q.106)

107. Why don't you have it... Is it
because... (ASK IN ROTATED
ORDER, STARTING WITH
CHECKED ITEM.)

[X] You decided you did not want it 56- 1
[] You did not meet the qualifications 2
Some other reason? 4
(describe)

DO NOT READ →

WAS ABLE TO GET IT / HAD THE SERVICE BUT
DISCONTINUED 5

Go on to next page →

IF NO (Q.105):

108. Why have you not tried to get this service?

57-

109. Is there any other reason why you have not tried to get this service?

58-

Go on to next page →

It happens that the phone company does offer a special type of phone service for lower income persons. This card describes who qualifies for it.

INTERVIEWER: HAND CARD A (IVORY). REVIEW THE INCOME QUALIFICATIONS WITH RESPONDENT.

110. Do you think you would qualify for this service? YES, THINK SO, MAYBE ... 1 (Continue below)
 NO, WOULD NOT ... 2 (Go to Q.901, ORANGE)
 NOT SURE ... 3 (Continue below)

IF WOULD QUALIFY OR NOT SURE (Q.110):

(60-5419)

111. Do you know about how much you now pay for your basic monthly telephone service and how much you pay for extra calls that are not included as part of the basic monthly service? RECORD AMOUNTS.
- Cost of basic service: $\frac{8}{61.62/62.64}$ per month
 Extra cost for calls: $\frac{8}{61.66/62.68}$ per month
 Don't know / No idea ... 0 69.
112. Well, aside from any calls you make, you are either paying a basic monthly rate of \$8.35 for Flat Rate or \$4.45 for Measured Rate. If you were to subscribe to Lifeline service, you would still pay whatever you do now for calls. However, you would save about \$5.17 per month if you have Flat Rate or \$3.22 per month if you have Measured Rate.
- Given those savings, would this make your monthly telephone service easier for you to afford or not? (PROBE:) Would that be much easier or just a little easier?
- Much easier to afford ... 1
 A little easier to afford ... 2
 No easier to afford ... 0
113. Assuming you are eligible for this special phone service, do you think you will get in touch with the phone company to sign up for it or will you continue doing what you do now?
- Sign up ... 1
 Continue doing what do now ... 2
114. What if there were some way for you to control the calls that cost extra. For example, the phone company could set some limit on those calls so you would not go over that limit... Would you be interested in this type of service or not?
- YES ... 1
 NO ... 2

901 Do you speak any languages, other than English?

YES
NO

(Ask Q.902a)

(Go to Q.906a, next page)

IF YES (Q.901):

902a. What are all the languages you speak at home including English? (DO NOT READ LIST) Any others? (Record below under Q.902, SPEAK AT HOME)

902b. (IF ENGLISH NOT MENTIONED, ASK:) Do you use English at home?

IF MORE THAN ONE, ASK:

903. Which one is used most often, at home? (Record below under Q.903 MOST OFTEN)

	Q.902 SPEAK AT HOME	Q.903 MOST OFTEN
ENGLISH	1	1
SPANISH		
FRENCH	3	3
ARABIC	4	4
CHINESE (OTHER)	7	7
JAPANESE	0	0
TAGALOG	1	1
HMONG	2	2
LAOTIAN	3	3
OTHER	4	4

(specify)

IF USE SPANISH, CHINESE, KOREAN OR VIETNAMESE AT HOME:

904. If you wanted to call the phone company to talk about phone service, which would you prefer to use — (LANGUAGE), English or does it make no difference to you?

PREFER (LANGUAGE)

PREFER ENGLISH

MAKES NO DIFFERENCE

14/15

906a. How long have you lived at this address?

6/12 YRS. 19/19 MOS.

906b. How many times have you moved in the past 5 years? 20/21 TIMES

907. Where were you born?

UNITED STATES 22/1 (Go to Q.909)

CUBA	2	} (Ask Q.908)
LATIN AMERICA	3	
SOUTH AMERICA	4	
CENTRAL AMERICA	5	
MEXICO	6	
ASIA / PHILIPPINES	7	
EUROPE	8	
OTHER	9	

(specify)

IF NOT IN U.S.:

908. How long have you lived in the United States?

23/24 YRS. 25/26 MOS.

909. Including yourself, how many people in total live here at this address?

TOTAL: 27/29 - IF ONLY ONE IN HH, SKIP TO Q.912

IF MORE THAN ONE (Q.909):

910. How many are ...

Adults 18 or over? 21

Children 13 to 18? 30

Children 6 to 12? 31

Children under 6? 32

INTERVIEWER: Be sure this adds to total in Q.909.

911. How many families live here at this address? (IF NECESSARY, SAY:) Well, if you were telling a friend about it, how many families would you say live here?

33/34 FAMILIES

ASK EVERYONE:

912. Does anyone living here in your home have a physical disability which makes it difficult for them to use the phone?

35
YES 1 (Ask Q.913)
NO 2 (Go to Q.914)

IF YES (Q.912):

913. What is the nature of the physical disability?

36
SPEECH 1
SIGHT 2
HEARING 3
MOBILITY 4
OTHER 5
(describe)

914. How would you describe your marital status?
Are you ... (READ CATEGORIES)

Married 37- 1
Separated 2
Divorced 3
Widowed 4
Single (Never married) 5

915. Is this a house, apartment or flat,
condominium, mobile home or some other type
of dwelling?

HOUSE 37- 1
APARTMENT / FLAT 2
CONDOMINIUM 3
SINGLE HOTEL ROOM 4
ROOM WITHIN AN APARTMENT / HOUSE 5
MOBILE HOME 6
OTHER: _____ 7
(describe)

916. Do you own or rent?

OWN 37- 1
RENT 2

917. Do you pay your own ... (READ LIST)

FOR EACH YES:

918. Do you pay by mail or in person?

	YES	NO
Water bills? 46- 1	X	
Electricity bills? 2	X	
Natural gas bills? 3	X	
Cable TV bill? 4	X	
Telephone bill? 5	X	

PAY BY...

	IN		OTHER	DK
	MAIL	PERSON		
47- 1	1	2		0
48- 1	1	2		0
49- 1	1	2		0
50- 1	1	2		0
51- 1	1	2		0

919. May I please ask your age?

_____ 46/47
YEARS

920. What is the highest level of education you
completed?

_____ 48
ELEMENTARY OR NONE 1
SOME HIGH SCHOOL 2
COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL (4 YRS) 3
SOME COLLEGE (1-3 YRS), TECHNICAL
SCHOOL / ASSOCIATE DEGREE (2 YEARS) 4
COMPLETED COLLEGE (4 YEARS) 5
POST GRADUATE (OVER 4 YEARS) 6
REFUSED 7

921. Are you currently employed either part-time or
full-time? (IF NOT EMPLOYED, CIRCLE
APPROPRIATE CODE)

_____ 49-
EMPLOYED FULL-TIME 1
EMPLOYED PART-TIME 2
TEMPORARILY UNEMPLOYED 3
HOMEMAKER FULL-TIME 4
STUDENT 5
RETIRED 6
OTHER _____ 7
(specify)
REFUSED 8

922. Would you describe your racial or ethnic background as...(READ CATEGORIES)

- | | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| White | 50 | 1 |
| Black or African American | | 2 |
| Spanish / Mexican or other Hispanic descent | | 3 |
| American Indian | | 4 |
| Asian, or | | 5 |
| Some other group _____ | (specify) | 6 |
| REFUSED | | 7 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 8 |

DO NOT READ {

IF "ASIAN" (Q.922):

923. Which Asian group is that?

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---|
| CHINESE | 51 | 1 |
| KOREAN | | 2 |
| VIETNAMESE | | 3 |
| FILIPINO | | 4 |
| JAPANESE | | 5 |
| HMONG | | 6 |
| LAOTIAN | | 7 |
| OTHER _____ | (specify) | 8 |

INTERVIEWER: HAND CARD C (GRAY)

924. And finally, which of the categories on this card best describes your total annual household income? You can just read me the letter that applies.

- | | | |
|--|----|---|
| A. \$15,300 OR LESS | 52 | 1 |
| B. BETWEEN \$15,301 AND \$17,900 | | 2 |
| C. BETWEEN \$17,901 AND \$21,500 | | 3 |
| D. BETWEEN \$21,501 AND \$25,100 | | 4 |
| E. BETWEEN \$25,101 AND \$28,700 | | 5 |
| F. BETWEEN \$28,701 AND \$32,300 | | 6 |
| G. BETWEEN \$32,301 AND \$35,900 | | 7 |

- | | | |
|--|----|---|
| H. BETWEEN \$35,901 AND \$39,500 | 53 | 1 |
| I. BETWEEN \$39,501 AND \$50,000 | | 2 |
| J. BETWEEN \$50,001 AND \$75,000 | | 3 |
| K. \$75,001 OR MORE | | 4 |
| REFUSED | | 5 |
| DON'T KNOW | | 6 |

925. How many people in your household, in total, including yourself, depend on that income?

_____ (record number) 54/55

926. How many people contribute to that income?

_____ (record number) 54/57

1001. Are all of the adults living here able to use your phone if they want to or are there adults living here who you don't allow to use your phone except perhaps in an emergency?

58
EVERYONE CAN USE 1 (Go to Q.1005)
SOME NOT ALLOWED TO USE .. 2 (Ask Q.1002)

IF SOME NOT ALLOWED TO USE (Q.1001):

1002. How many adults are not allowed to use your phone except, perhaps, in an emergency?

ADULTS 59
(record number)

1003. What is their relationship to you?

60
SPOUSE 1
UNMARRIED PARTNER 2
OTHER RELATIVE 3
NOT RELATED TO RESPONDENT 4

1004. Are any of these adults available now so that I could interview them?

61
YES .. 1***
NO ... 2

1005. Are there any families living here who do not have their own phone service?

62
YES 1 (Ask Q.1006)
2 OR MORE SHARE SERVICE .. 2 (Go to Q.1008)
NO 3 (Go to Q.1008)

IF YES (Q.1005):

1006. How many families living here do not have their own phone service?

FAMILIES 63

1007. Is there an adult member of (the family) (one of the families) that I could interview?

64
YES .. 1***
NO ... 2

IF "YES" TO Q.1004 OR Q.1007 INTERVIEW THAT PERSON USING A
"NON-CUSTOMER" FORM. ATTACH IT TO THIS INTERVIEW

1008. RECORD SEX: MALE 1
FEMALE 2

Those are all the questions I have. May I have your name and telephone number just in case my supervisor needs to verify this interview?

Name: _____

Telephone #: _____
(area code) (number)

Address: _____

City: _____ Zip code: _____

ALSO RECORD: _____

Interviewer name: _____

Date of interview: _____ / _____ / _____ Interview Length: _____

Time End: _____ : _____
(HR) (MIN)
66/67 68/69

INTERVIEWER: Be **SURE** you have recorded the Block Cluster Number and Line Number on page 1 of this CUSTOMER form.

Affordability of Telephone Service

**Volume 2
(Reissued*)
-- Customer Survey --**

conducted for
GTE and Pacific Bell

***Reissued: see insert on next page for explanation.**

Field Work: September - October, 1993

Note to the Reader

This volume is a REISSUE of the original report

Explanation

A few days after the Customer Survey (Volume 2 of the Affordability Study) was filed at the California Public Utilities Commission, Field Research was asked to look into a difference between a statistic in its report and a statistic in another report (the Fraud Study conducted by SRI) which had also just been filed. A portion of the SRI report uses Census data to estimate that 80% of all households that qualify for Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS) have it. The Field Research Customer Survey report showed 48% of customers who qualify for it have ULTS. While the two studies are quite different in many respects, one would expect a closer correspondence with respect to ULTS penetration (80% vs. 48%).

Using the statistics from the Customer Survey (30% qualify for ULTS, 48% of qualifieds have ULTS), we were able to predict with reasonable accuracy the known number of ULTS subscribers. Thus, we were assured that our estimates were reliable within the normal range of sampling error and that the 80% figure, derived from Census data, was too high. (SRI acknowledges in its report that the Census may underreport low income households.)

Further Analysis

In the process of looking into this, we made some further analyses of our customer data just to be sure we were not overlooking anything.

This analysis identified something that we had not seen earlier: ULTS penetration among qualified customers is significantly higher in the special (augmented) samples of low income customers than among low income customers found in the cross-section samples. (ULTS penetration also appears to be higher among Blacks in the augment as compared to Blacks in the cross-section samples although base sizes are very small.) These special samples are used to provide an adequate number of Blacks and low income customers for analysis; they are drawn from areas known to have 30% or more of the desired characteristic. The low income augmented sample was weighted back into the total using a proxy for low income, specifically whether they "say they have ULTS". While we often find that respondents in the special augmentations tend to have a somewhat lower socio-economic status than their counterparts in the cross-section samples, the differences are typically very small and do not affect the overall findings as long as they are weighted to bring them into their proper proportion. In this particular case, we found that there is a VERY HIGH rate of ULTS penetration in these special Black and low income samples, much higher than among Blacks and low income customers found in the cross-sections.

Table 1

	GTE				Pacific Bell			
	Low Income		Black		Low Income		Black	
	Cross- sect. %	Aug- ment %	Cross- sect. %	Aug- ment %	Cross- sect. %	Aug- ment %	Cross- sect. %	Aug- ment %
Qualify for ULTS	100	100	29	55	100	100	37	63
Aware of ULTS	75	82	78	70	85	84	75	68
Have ULTS (co. records) (a)	37	53	44	52	62	71	38	54
Say have ULTS (a)	40	58	67	60	55	62	32	57
Base (total)	(354)	(178)	(48)	(110)	(457)	(194)	(96)	(59)
Base (qualify)	(354)	(178)	(21)	(60)	(457)	(194)	(46)	(37)

(a) among those who qualify for ULTS

This higher ULTS penetration in these special low income and Black samples undoubtedly reflects the community outreach programs which have targeted these areas. The data show that these efforts have been highly successful – more so than one sees by simply looking at a cross-section of low income or Black customers.

Unfortunately, using "say they have ULTS" to bring the low income special sample back into its proper proportion affected the total findings (i.e. the total weighted data were different than the cross-sections which they should not be). We, therefore, re-weighted the data using a three level weight: (1) qualify and have ULTS, (2) qualify, but don't have ULTS, (3) don't qualify/can't determine. The percentages used in the weighting are those obtained from the cross-section samples which provide the best estimates for these variables.

Effect on Findings

Most of the findings in the report should not be and, in fact, are not affected by the re-weighting - the actual percentage may change by a couple of percentage points, but the substantive findings are the same as in the original report.

The major changes are in Chapter 2. Specifically, this report shows a lower percentage of customers qualifying for ULTS and a somewhat higher percentage of qualified customers having ULTS.

Table 2

	Original Report			Revised Report		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Qualify for ULTS	30	28	30	24	21	24
% of those who qualify who have it	48	29	52	57	37	62

The above percentages also predict with reasonable accuracy the known number of ULTS customers. Tables 3 and 4, following, illustrate how the survey statistics can be used to predict the number of known ULTS subscribers for each company.

A complete description of the revised weighting is included in the Survey Method, Appendix A.

This revision does NOT affect any of the findings reported in the Non-Customer Survey, Volume 1 of the Affordability Study.

Table 3
GTE

Number ULTS subscribers (a)	294,019
% have ULTS (b)	11.5%
Number GTE customers (a + b)	2,556,686

	Range based on sampling error (f)		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Survey Statistics</u>	<u>High</u>
Total GTE customers	2,556,686	2,556,686	2,556,686
% qualify ULTS (c)	.18	.21	.24
Total qualified	460,203	536,904	613,605
% have ULTS (d)	.33	.37	.41
Total qualify and have	151,867	198,654	251,578
Have/don't qualify (e)	27,049	27,049	27,049
Total ULTS subscribers	178,916	225,703	278,627
Actual # ULTS subscribers	294,019	294,019	294,019
			↑

NOTES:

- (a) From company counts
- (b) From total cross-section sample of listings (not just those who were interviewed)
- (c) Survey statistic
- (d) Survey statistic
- (e) From SRI survey showing 9.2% of ULTS subscribers do not meet qualifications
- (f) Based on degrees of sampling error for specific statistics shown determined by sample size

Table 4
Pacific Bell

Number ULTS subscribers (a)	1,891,968
% have ULTS (b)	21.0%
Number PB customers (a ÷ b)	9,009,371

	Range based on sampling error (f)		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Survey Statistics</u>	<u>High</u>
Total PB customers	9,009,371	9,009,371	9,009,371
% qualify ULTS (c)	.21	.24	.27
Total qualified	1,891,968	2,162,249	2,432,530
% have ULTS (d)	.58	.62	.66
Total qualify and have	1,097,341	1,340,594	1,605,470
Have/don't qualify (e)	174,061	174,061	174,061
Total ULTS subscribers	1,271,402	1,514,655	1,779,531
Actual # ULTS subscribers	1,891,968	1,891,968	1,891,968 ↑

ULTS penetration among those who qualify is probably in the 66% area
(assuming the SRI estimate of 9.2% is correct).

Contents

Foreword	i
Research Objectives and Study Design Plan (Brief Overview)	iii
SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS	S-1
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	S-15
 The Findings in Detail	
Chapter 1: Descriptive Profiles of Residential Customers (by Company, Ethnicity/Race)	1
Chapter 2: Awareness, Penetration Rates (among Qualified Customers) and Interest in Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS)	33
Chapter 3: Descriptive Profiles of ULTS Subscribers and Non-Subscribers Who Qualify for It	54
Chapter 4: Perceived Affordability of Telephone Service	59
Chapter 5: Experiences with Telephone Company	74
Chapter 6: Preferences for Telephone Bill Paying	98

Appendices

Survey Method Appendix A

 Background and Questionnaire Development A-2

 Non-Customer Survey Method A-4

 Customer Survey Method A-13

 Reliability of the Findings A-25

Survey Materials Appendix B

 Questionnaire (English only)¹

¹Questionnaire was translated into Spanish, Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese. Copies of the translations as well as a complete set of the materials used in the conduct of this study are contained in Volume 3, Technical Appendix.

Foreword

This study was conducted in response to the following ordering paragraph:

"Pacific and GTE-C shall, in conjunction with DRA, conduct a study of telephone service affordability and allow DRA to participate if it so desires."

Field Research was commissioned to conduct two studies, one among non-customers and one among customers.

This report presents the findings from the customer portion of the Affordability Study. Findings from the non-customer portion of the study can be found in Volume 1. A third volume, titled "Affordability Study: Technical Appendix" contains the materials used in the conduct of the two studies including translations of the various questionnaires.

Because the findings from these studies were to be presented in a series of oral presentations to both Clients, the DRA and various community groups, Field Research used a large typeface that would lend itself to oral/visual presentations of the data.

Acknowledgements

The development of this research project included ideas from many leaders of California's diverse communities. They provided over 200 initial ideas that were ultimately used in the development of the research plan. Subsequent to that they reviewed the draft questionnaire and provided significant ideas which were incorporated into the final questionnaire used in the research.

Leo Avila	American GI Forum	Modesto
Marla Scharf	California Dept. of Consumer Affairs	Sacramento
Cheryl Jacobsen	California/Nevada Community Action Assoc.	Sacramento
Irene Pham	The Cambodian Family, Inc.	Santa Ana
Rod Wright	Congresswoman Maxine Waters	Los Angeles
Anna Alvarez-Boyd	Consumer Action	San Francisco
Ken McEldowney	Consumer Action	San Francisco
Shelley Bergum	Deaf & Disabled Telecommunications Program	Oakland
Ibrahim Naeem	Diversity Consultant	San Diego
Dolores Sanchez	Eastern Group Publishing	Los Angeles
Tommy Fulcher	Economic & Social Opportunities Inc.	San Jose
Pablo Jasis	Hispanic Consumer Advocate	Oakland
Doua Vang	Hmong Council	Fresno
Sylvia Gonzalez	International Institute of Los Angeles	Los Angeles
Bong Hwan Kim	Korean Youth & Community Center	Los Angeles
Marina Pineda	La Raza Centro Legal	San Francisco
Shannon Reeves	NAACP	Los Angeles
Anni Chung	Self Help for the Elderly	San Francisco
Audrie Kraus	TURN	San Francisco
Irene Putnam	Union of Pan Asian Communities	San Diego

Research Overview

Objectives

The broad objectives of the Affordability Study were three-fold:

To determine reasons for not having telephone service

To explore the affordability of telephone service

To provide the means for updating penetration rates by company and by ethnicity/race in areas of low telephone penetration (1990 U.S. Census)

Research Approach

Two studies were undertaken:

(a) Non-Customer Survey (in areas with less than 90% telephone penetration, U.S. Census, 1990)

(b) Customer Survey

This volume presents the findings from the Customer Survey. The findings from the Non-Customer Survey are presented in Volume 1. For convenience, a detailed description of the survey methodology for both studies is included in Appendix A of each report.

Research Objectives: Customer Survey

The customer survey had three broad objectives:

1. To ascertain the perceived affordability of telephone service among the following groups of interest:

- GTE and Pacific Bell customers

- ULTS subscribers (GTE and Pacific Bell)

- ULTS qualified customers

- Hispanic customers

- Black customers

- Chinese customers

- Korean customers

- Vietnamese customers

- Low income seniors (qualify ULTS, age 60 or over)

2. To measure awareness, penetration and interest in Universal Lifeline Telephone Service
3. To provide additional perspective for evaluating the responses of non-customers with a matched set of customers who reside in low telephone penetration areas (the Non-Customer Survey, Volume 1)

Study Design Plan: Overview

Telephone interviews were conducted with cross-section samples of each identified group of interest.

A total of 3,656 telephone interviews were completed.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>
Cross-section:			
Residential customers	1,288	651	637
ULTS subscribers	694	313	381
ULTS qualified (low income)	472	223	249
Special augmentations:			
Black	169	110	59
Chinese	283	143	140
Korean	300	150	150
Vietnamese	288	148	140
Low income seniors	162	79	83
Grand Total	3,656	1,817	1,839

Combining the Samples for Analysis

The residential customer, ULTS subscriber and low income (ULTS) cross-section samples each yielded some interviews with the various minority subgroups of interest. Additional interviews were done in each subgroup to yield the desired minimum of 300 interviews in total for each subgroup. All samples except the Asian and low income senior augments were combined and the data were weighted to bring each group into its proper proportion for looking at “total customer” findings.

This yielded the following numbers of interviews in each cell of interest:

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>
Residential total	<u>3,656</u>	<u>1,817</u>	<u>1,839</u>
Hispanic customers	766	354	412
Black customers	375	175	200
Chinese customers	317	156	161
Korean customers	306	154	152
Vietnamese customers	308	156	152
Low income seniors	428	207	221
ULTS subscribers	1,297	550	747
ULTS eligible (low income)	1,280	592	688

How the Sampling Was Done

Residential customer and ULTS subscriber samples:

Samples of these customers were drawn from each company's total California residential customer universe using systematic random sampling techniques, i.e. every Nth listing starting at a random point in the total universe.

Black, low income and Asian samples:

While the methods varied somewhat by company and by subgroup, the approach called for identifying wire centers (GTE) or Census Tracts (Pacific Bell) known to have 30% - 50% of the desired characteristic, drawing a sample of listings from those areas and then conducting telephone screening interviews among those listings to find households with the desired characteristic.

Implementation

All interviewing was done by telephone from central location telephone interviewing facilities where trained interviewers work under full-time supervision of company staff.

Field Research did all interviewing except the Asian samples. Asian samples were subcontracted to an ethnic minority market and survey research firm.

Asian interviewing was done using paper/pencil. All other interviewing was done using FRC's CATI interviewing facility.

Four calls were made to complete an interview at each listing.

Calls were made on different days and at different times of day.

Interviewing was limited to late afternoons, evenings and weekends.

Field Dates

Interviewing for the Customer Survey started on September 20, 1993 and was completed on October 28, 1993.

Statistical Weights

Weights were applied to correct for the fact that certain groups were, in effect, “oversampled” to yield enough interviews in those groups to provide a reasonably high level of precision for the findings.

Company weight: Required to bring GTE and Pacific Bell into their proper proportion. Used company estimates of number of customer households.

ULTS weight: Required to bring ULTS subscribers and non-subscribers into their proper proportion. Used company data on ULTS penetration.

Ethnicity weight: Required to bring each ethnic/racial group back into its proper proportion. Used findings from survey cross-sections to determine proportions.

Low income/ULTS qualified weight: Required to bring the low income samples into their proper proportion. Used findings from the survey cross-sections to determine proportions.

Asian and low income senior samples are not included in the weighted data (except for those found in the cross-section). These groups are examined on an unweighted basis.